

ಎಂಬೆ ಬಿ. ಎಂ.

SRI G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—This is a problem which affects the entire rural population. When I asked the Deputy Commissioner, he said that there was no funds to spend for that purpose. I have also received letter from him stating that there was no funds. The Department of Public Health Engineering spares mechanics for the repair of the equipments. But the difficulty is about the funds. So, the Government should take up this matter very seriously and see that sufficient funds are placed at the disposal of the Deputy Commissioners of each District to provide drinking water to the rural population.

SRI K. PRABHAKAR.—Arrangements have already been made to place sufficient funds at the disposal of the Deputy Commissioners. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತು ಈದತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಾಧಪಟ್ಟಿಂಧ ಮಾತಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾಂತಿಂದ ಈ ಕೊರತೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮಾನಸಿಂಚೆ ಅಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಿಂಬಿಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರ ತಾಳ್ವಳಕು ಮಾಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿ.ಎಂ. ಅದರ ಕಾಂಪೊಲೋನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಮ್ಯಾಕ್ರೋನಿಕ್ ಪನು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಿಂಧ ಸಂಯುಕ್ತಾಗಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲದೆನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆದಿಪಣಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಿಡಿತ ಸ್ವೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಏಷ್ಟು ಮಂದು ಇಂಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂಬೆಂದು ಅಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡಂತು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾಡಲಿತವಾಗಿ ಅಯಾಯಾ ಪರಿಯಾದಿಲ್ಲ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಂಬಿಕು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಏರಡು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾನಿಕೆಗಳಿಂದು ದೃಢವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೆನ್ನು ಮಂದಿರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾನು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾಂತ್ರಿಕವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದರೆ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿರಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವ ದೃಢವಾಗಿ ಯಾನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಡಿ.ಎಂ. ಪರಿ ದೃಢ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊರತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವೀರಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರತಿರುಪದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊರತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಈದತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಕೊರತೆ ಇತ್ತು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಈ ಕೊರತೆಯು ನಿರಾರಣೆಗೆ ನಳಕ್ಕೆ ಪರಿಬಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

### Matters Under Rule 312

(i) re : Sealing of the office room of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda of Bangalore University.

† SRI K. PUTTASWAMY (Chamaraja).—Sir, I am raising a point under Rule 312. This relates to the conduct of Bangalore City Police in locking the office of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda of Bangalore University. I have come to know that the office room of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda both in Jnanabharathi and also the post-graduate centre at Central College are locked for the purpose of conducting a search in the office. Sir, I am aware that we cannot question the conduct of the Police. If the circumstances necessitate locking up rooms for the purpose of search or breaking open the lock for the purpose of search. That arises only on the basis of the complaint

Asterisks indicate that remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.

that was preferred to the Police. I have come to know that the substance of the complaint preferred by the Police did not warrant locking of rooms to conduct search. Sir, I learn that the complaint was that the Professor was trying to favour a student in respect of a matter relating to his examination. After the conduct of the examination when the valuation of papers are over, howsoever eminent the Professor may be, howsoever influential or powerful he may be, he would not be able to show any favour to any student. It has to be done by the University itself. At the best what the Professor can do is to write a letter to the University bringing the circumstances which require a generous attitude of the University towards the student. The complaint is also to the effect that the Professor had written a letter to the Vice-Chancellor in respect of a student relating to the examination. If that is correct then, whatever letters he might have written could have been secured from the University. It was unnecessary either to lock the rooms or to search the rooms of the Professor. What are the contents of the complaint? On the basis of that complaint whether any additional information has been received by the Police and whether there is any justification for locking the rooms and conducting a search? I am deliberately confining to this subject, I know there are several matters agitating the minds of the public and also the Members of this House. But I am referring to this one incident where according to me, and on the information that I have come to know, the conduct of the Police in locking the rooms of the Professor was not justified.

† శ్రీ ఎస్. ఆర్. బొమ్మలు (హెచ్.ఎస్.) — మాన్స్ అడ్మిక్షన్, మాన్స్ ప్రటిస్టుమియిపరు బెంగళూరు విశ్వవిద్యానిలయస్కె సంబంధప్రతి ఒట్టు ప్రైఫేసర్ రూప్యగ్రంతిల్లి కేలి పూఢి సచ్చే మార్కులు బగ్గె హేడ్లుద్దరు. అవర బగ్గె దారినల్లి if there was any allegation against the Professor and he is made accused, ఆగ ఒందు రీతియింద ప్రోలీసరు సచ్చే మాడుపుడ్చే అధికార ఇదే. Incriminating article relating to offence ఇదే ఎన్ను వచ్చాచార పోలీస్ రిగర్ ఇద్దరి అల్లి సచ్చే మాడుపుడక్కె ప్రోలీస్ రిగర్ అధికార బరుత్తదే. అదరె అల్లి ఆరెడ అగ్గిల్లి. కాగాగాలే ఈ సభెల్లుల్లి ఓందె నెడంధ ఘటనయ బగ్గె నెమ్మ అభిప్రాయమన్న నావు వ్యక్త మందిద్దించే. కాలోజ్స్ ద్యేర్క్షర్ మేలే ఆదంధ అటుకో బగ్గె ఇదే సభెయ సదస్యురు, ప్రోలీసరు ఆ బగ్గె సంశో క్రమ తేదేమాకొల్పు బోకెందు హేలేద్దేవే. అవరు యాచ క్రమమన్న తెగుఁకొల్పు దిద్దాగ ఒబ్బ కాన్సెస్టేబుల్లన్న సస్పెండ్ మాడిద్దార. వాగి మాడబేకాద్ద అవర కట్టమ్మ. ఆమ్మలే బెంగళూరు విశ్వవిద్యా నిలయమ ఒట్టు ప్రైఫేసర్ రాజర రూప్యమన్న సచ్చే మాడురువుడక్కె కారణ ఏందు నాము తిళదుకొల్పుబేకాగిద. ఇంత్తు ఇదన్ను యేళుదాగ ఈ ఒందు ఏప్పుపుద్దునిలయిదల్లి కాయ్క మాడక్కెంద ఒట్టు ప్రైఫేసర్ రావర రూప్యుగి కేలి డాకి సచ్చే మాడిదర ఆదర బందు పరిణామమన్న నావు అల్లోజనె మాడబేకా, ఒట్టు గాల్కె పుట్టుపకర గౌరవద బగ్గె, అవరు అవర కట్టమ్మ వాపున్న నడిశికొండు హేగమ బగ్గె పంగిసుచ దృష్టియింద రూప్యమన్న సచ్చే మాడబేకఁదర సాకప్పు ఆధారగాళు ఇరచేకు. ఇల్లదే హోదరె కాన్సానిన దురుప యోగపాగుత్తదే. ఆ పూర్ణమ్మపకర అపమ్మనద దృష్టియిందలే ఈ ఒందు కాయ్క నడెదిద్ద ఆదు బిండియే ఆ బగ్గె సాకారదవరు ఈ సభెగే తిళిసచేకు, ఆవర బగ్గె ఏనాదరూ

దారూగళు ఇదెయే ? అవర బగ్గె ఏనాదచ్చ ఇన్కాక్కిమినేటింగ్ ఆటికెచల్ ఇదెయే ఎందు నాను కేళబెంకాగిదె. నావు పెత్తికెట్టు ఒదిద ప్రకార అచరు చ్చోచుస్తులుగి బచేంచ పెట్టుద కాబియున్న తేగెదుకొళు ప చ్చెప్పియింద రూమాన్న లాక్స్ మాడిదరు. ఆ పెత్త ఆచర చీటిల్ల మేళే ఇత్తు, ఆ మేళే ఇదస్తు సజ్ఞ మాడి తేగెదుకొండిదు రే ఎందు నావు పత్రికెయుల్లి బంద చరది చుప్పేన తీలుదుకొండిద్దే యే. చుప్పువాద ఏప్పుం ఇష్టే ఆఇద్ది రూమాన్న లాక్స్ మాడువ అచ్చుకె ఇరల్లెల్ల. The original letter was with the Vice-Chancellor. Copy was on the table ఎందు హేళద్దారే. ఒరిజినల్లో లెట్టర్ వేస్టోచున్న రోరచర క్యూట్ల్లు ఇద్ద రే అచరే స్టుతి బందు సజ్ఞ కండకప్పి దాడి ఇంకండ చుందు వాతావరణమస్తు నిమజ్ఞ మాడతక్కుంచ ఆపత్కాకె ఇరుత్తు ఇరుత్తు ఇరల్లెల్ల ఏటుచు ఇదరింద స్ట్రెచ్చువాగుత్తుదే. ఇదు నాను పత్రికెయుల్లి ఒదిదంతద ఏప్పాం చేళిత్తిద్దేనే. ఈ బగ్గె మేళునేయుల్లా జింగులుగా దిగుచుయాగిదె. జింగులూరు ఏప్పివొస్తునిలుయుదల్లు అభిప్రయుల్లు యారే ఇరల్ల అచర గోరచక్కె డశే బరక్కుంచ రీతియుల్లి ఈ ఘటన నడెయుచురాదాగితు. మాను గోకాకోరచరు, మాను నరసించుయ్యునిపరచిత గోకాకోరు ఒందు కాలదల్లి జింగులూరు ఏశ్విధా సిలుయుదల్లిచు కొండు రాజుసాముయున్న కొట్టిపు హోదంతద ప్రసంగ ఒళ్ళియుచుగిల్ల. అవత్తినిదివస నాను, చూన్న గోకాకాకర మసెయుల్లే ఇద్ద సు. ఆచరు తమ్మ కంఠయున్న హేళ ఆ చిత్తవిధా సిలుయుదల్ల నాను చుందువరియుచుక్కే ఇష్టుపడుచుదిల్ల ఎందు హేళదంతద వాతమస్తు కేళిచేసేనే, వాన్న నరసించుయ్యునిపరచురు రాజుసాము కొట్టిపు బిట్టిపు హోద ఏప్పారగళ బగ్గె సమగ్ర ఏప్పారక వాడుచుపడక్కె శక్కారిదచరు ఒట్టుపైరై పందు పత్రికెపుల్లి బందిదుపడున్న నాను ఒదిద్దేనే. ఏప్పాధిగళు చుంత్తు ఏప్పాధిసాయశక్కారు సద ఆడేస్త అభిప్రయుచువస్తు హేళద్దారే. వాన్న చుప్పుమంతిరుయపరూ సద ఇంట్లే ఇద్దారే. అచరల్లు నిస్స సమిసుచు బుధుధునే ఏనందరే ఈ ఏశ్విధా సిలుయుదల్లరక్కుంధ దోషింగుల్లిగ్గు హోగి నిస్స రాజుక్క కేతీత తరువంధ ఏశ్విధా సిలుయువగా అదు మాపాడాగావంతే మాడబేచు. అల్లిరువ దోషిగుల బగ్గె సమగ్రవాద ఏప్పారణెయున్న సదేస్త అవుగళమ్మ సరిపడితక్కంధ మచేస్త యున్న మాడువ బగ్గె మాన్న చుప్పుమంతిరుయపరు తప్పు అభిపూపువస్తు తీళసచ్చికెందు నఁసు అచరల్లు కేళకొళుత్తేనే.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URUS.—Sir, regarding the matter raised by hon. Member Sri K. Puttaswamy, I wish to make this brief statement :

The Commissioner of Police, Bangalore City, received information on 23rd March 1978 that Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda was in possession of a letter written by him to the Vice-Chancellor, regarding the performance of a student, Rangaswamy in examination. The Commissioner tried to verify this from the Professor, but the letter was not immediately available. As the student Rangaswamy was concerned in some cases under investigation in connection with the disturbances in Bangalore University, the Commissioner of Police thought it necessary to search for and seize the letter alleged to be written. In order to ensure that the letter will not be lost, the local police sealed the chambers of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda both in the Central College and Jnana Bharathi on 23rd March 1978. This was done with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. Later, between 1-30 p.m. and 2-30 p.m. the room in Jnana Bharathi was searched in the presence of the Registrar and the Controller of Examinations. The office copy of a letter addressed by Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda to

the Controller of Examinations was seized under a mahazar, for purposes of investigation in Cr. No. 231/78 of Ulsoore Gate Police Station. The gist of the letter was to the effect that Sri Rangaswamy may be permitted to do the sessionals so that Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda may conduct the Sessionals for him. After seizure of the letter, the rooms were released.

This information I have before me, Sir. Now, the information I have given to the house is self-explanatory. I have just placed before the House the circumstances under which the search had to be made.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am happy, Sir, that the gist of what I stated, on information, is borne out by the information supplied by the Government. I would like the Hon. Chief Minister to bestow some thought on the information that he has furnished to the House. Even in my preliminary remarks, I said that all their attempt was to find out a copy of the letter that Dr. Venkatagiri Gowda was reported to have written to the University. Sir, the original was in possession of the University. So, there was no need or justification for taking this extreme step of locking the room and searching the office of the Professor. Now, In the eye of Law, there cannot be any discrimination. Whether he is a Lecturer, or a Professor or the Vice-Chancellor or a peon, in the eye of Law are same. I am not saying that because it concerns a Professor, the matter is big. When the original was there, when the substance was in the University, where was the necessity to try to catch the shadow? Supposing the University had destroyed that letter and if that letter was very important for this case, then, I can understand the necessity for a search.

Supposing I express my opinion, then it would be a opinion of the individual member. Now I am requesting the Hon. Chief Minister to bestow some thought and tell us whether in his opinion this is justified.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URUS.—I am not here to sit in judgement over what has taken place. In the ultimate analysis, the Police Officers have erred in their discretion. It is for the proper authorities to look into. I cannot say. But, under the circumstances, it is apparent that the Professor was alleged to have written a letter either to the Vice-Chancellor or to somebody else. This was with reference to a case already registered against a student by name Rangaswamy in connection with the disturbances in Bangalore University. It is alleged that the Professor was interested in Rangaswamy's passing the examination. That was the allegation and in that connection. Prof. Gowda appears to have written to the Vice-Chancellor or to

somebody else. Whether it was a vague information, or whether it was addressed to the Vice-Chancellor or the Controller of Examinations, at that stage, was not known. If it was to the Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor would have had the letter which he has received from him but it was found that the alleged letter was written to the Controller of Examinations.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—The Controller of Examinations is a part of the University.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URС.—The allegation is that both of them have combined. Unless the Controller is willing to produce the letter, how is it possible? The Controller of Examinations may not produce it.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Then, simultaneously they should have conducted the search of the Controller's Office also. I cannot understand that a situation where a Vice-Chancellor can have no control over the Controller of Examinations.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URС.—In your view, it may be so. But subsequently after the search which was duly conducted, we have got a copy of the letter found in his room. Subsequently what is going to happen, I cannot say at this stage.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—In your statement you have stated that the Commissioner of Police, Bangalore City, received information on 23rd March 1978 to the effect that Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda was in possession of a letter written by him to the Vice-Chancellor regarding the performance of a student, Rangaswamy in examination.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URС.—That is an information.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Vice-Chancellor was contacted before the room was locked and they must have questioned the Vice-Chancellor whether such a letter had been received by him.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URС.—The letter must have been written to someone else.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The statement says that the letter addressed to the Controller of Examinations was seized. In that case simultaneously, action should have been taken. Then, there are some serious allegations against this University.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URС.—I think the Minister for Education has already stated about it. The Government have requested the Chancellor to look into these affairs and conduct internal inquiry or constitute a Committee to review the whole question.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Let the Hon. Minister for Education say about the steps he had taken in this connection.

SRI B. SUBBAIAH SHETTY.—In the other House there was a demand that some inquiry regarding the working of the Bangalore University should be held. Under Section 61, Chapter XI, subject to correction, of the Universities Act, there is a provision for inquiring into the entire working of the University by appointing a Review Commission. So, the Government are requesting the Chancellor to constitute such a Review Commission and to inquire into the entire working of the University and we are also conveying to the Chancellor the things that have transpired in the other House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಿ. ರಾವ್ ದೇವ್.— ಏನು ವಿಚಾರಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇದು ಯಾವಿನಿವಿಷಯ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಡೆದ ಫುಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯೇ? ಅಥವಾ ಯಾವಿನಿವಿಷಯ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರೋ? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಳಗ್ಗೆ ಹಿಡಿತವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದಿನಂದಲೂ ವಿಚಾರಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI B. SUBBAIAH SHETTY.—As contemplated under Chapter XI, it will be conducted.

(ii) *re: Suicid<sup>o</sup> of a teenaged girl due to molestation by a doctor at Victoria Hospital, Bangalore.*

SMT. S. PRAMILA (Chamarajpet).—Sir, I wish to raise a matter under rule 312 regarding the alleged suicide committed by Smt. Leelavathi due to molestation by Dr. Thimmareddy in Victoria Hospital, Bangalore.

SRI M. MALLAPPA (Minister for Health).—Sir, I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the Chief Minister.

On 28th March 1978 at 5-30 p. m one Srinivasa, S/o Papaiah resident of No. 8 Vayapurigalli, Kalasipalyam, informed the Kalasipalyam Police that at about 2-30 p. m. he noticed smoke from upstairs and when he went up along with his neighbours they found his elder sister Padmavathi (Leelavathi, aged 23 years, dead. She had burnt herself after pouring Kerosene oil on her body. There was a Kerosene stove by her side. (According to him she was having some mental trouble and so she was going to Victoria Hospital very often.) On this statement a case at Crime No. 8/78 under section 174 Criminal Procedure Code was registered as Unnatural Death. The Police took up the investigation and the Inquest was conducted over the dead body. The Post-mortem was done on 29th March 1978 and the Medical Officer has opined that the death was due to shock as a result of burns. On 29th March 1978, Srinivasa, brother of the deceased Leelavathi produced a letter written in Kannada by the deceased. The letter was dated 26th March 1978 addressed to the Commissioner of Police, Bangalore and copied to Police Inspector